

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</b>	:	<b>CRIMINAL NO. 01:04-CR-0080</b>
	:	
	:	<b>(Judge Conner)</b>
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	
	:	
<b>ALBERTO DEJESUS RODRIGUEZ</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 7th day of October, 2005, upon consideration of the motion (Doc. 43) for reconsideration of the sentence imposed upon the defendant in the above-captioned case, and it appearing that the motion does not aver any manifest errors of law or fact, or present any newly discovered evidence, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) ("The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence."); Dodge v. Susquehanna Univ., 796 F. Supp. 829, 830 (M.D. Pa. 1992) (cautioning that mere disagreement with the court does not translate into a clear error of law); see also FED. R. CRIM. P. 35(a) (allowing court to correct a sentence "that resulted from arithmetical, technical, or other clear error"), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 43) for reconsideration is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner  
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER  
United States District Judge